



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
097161,520	09/29/98	SATO	J SON-1450/DIV

RONALD P. KANANEN, ESQ.
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20TH STREET NW, SUITE 501
WASHINGTON DC 20036

IM61/0429

EXAMINER

POWELL, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED: 04/29/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/161,520

Applicant(s)

Sato

Examiner

Powell, A.

Group Art Unit

1763



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 16-21 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☒ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) 08/739,101.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang et al.

Wang et al disclose a method of polishing or planarizing the surface of a work piece by chemical mechanical polishing (CMP) means by applying an aqueous slurry comprising water, submicron solid particles such as boehmite and an oxidizing agent (col. 1, lines 9-13; col. 3, lines 20-24; col. 4, lines 26-31). Wang et al disclose particles that are more abrasive than silica (col.2, lines 23-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1763

4. Claims 12-14 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al in view of Pearson and Krusell.

Wang et al do not disclose expressly the formation of boehmite and a wafer cleaning by a $\text{NH}_4\text{OH}-\text{H}_2\text{O}_2-\text{H}_2\text{O}$ solution followed by a hydrofluoric acid solution and rinse in pure water.

Pearson discloses a method of making a microcrystalline boehmite product mixing an alumina seed material with water and a less expensive alumina product to form an aqueous slurry that is hydrothermally digested (Fig. 5; col. 3, lines 10-22; col. 4, lines 54-55). An aluminum product reads on sodium aluminate.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill on the art to combine the method of making a boehmite product of Pearson with the CMP method of Wang et al.

The motivation for doing so would have been to provide boehmite particles as abrasives for a CMP slurry

Wang et al and Pearson do not disclose expressly a wafer cleaning by a $\text{NH}_4\text{OH}-\text{H}_2\text{O}_2-\text{H}_2\text{O}$ solution followed by a hydrofluoric acid solution and rinse in pure water.

Krusell et al disclose prior art with steps for wafer cleaning with a $\text{NH}_4\text{OH}-\text{H}_2\text{O}_2-\text{H}_2\text{O}$ solution followed by a hydrofluoric acid solution and rinse in pure water (col. 1, lines 9-12 and 45-64).

It would have been obvious to combine wafer cleaning of Krusell et al with the CMP method of Wang et al and Pearson.

Art Unit: 1763

The motivation for doing so would have been to remove residual contaminants from the wafer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wang et al with Pearson and Krusell et al to obtain the invention as specified in claims 12-14 and 16-21.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Alva C. Powell at telephone number (703) 305-0541.


Bruce Breneman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700